

Remarks

Claims 11-13 are pending herein. By this Amendment, claims 11-13 have been amended.

Support for the amendments made to the claims can be found in the specification at, e.g., page 12, lines 11-12; page 14, lines 13-19; page 15, lines 18-34; and page 16, lines 1-32.

In the Office Action, claims 11-13 are rejected under:

- 35 U.S.C. §101;
- 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and
- 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,674,306 to Hoshino.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 11-13 are rejected under §101 because the invention is said to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. According to the Office Action, claim 11 requires both apparatus and method steps.

By this Amendment, claim 11 has been amended to replace the method steps with structural language. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11 is directed to statutory subject matter.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 11-13 are rejected under §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

This rejection is based in part on the recitation in claim 11 of both method and apparatus steps. As noted above, claim 11 has been amended to replace the method steps with structural language.

The Office Action further states that the term “predetermined straightness” at line 4 of claim 11 reads on a nebulous mental state conducted prior to the manipulative steps of the claimed process, which renders the claim unclear. Claim 11 has been further amended to delete the term “predetermined straightness”.

In addition, the Office Action states that the last two lines of claim 11 has a group which is similar to accepted form for alternative expressions but there is no indication that the group is

“consisting of” the members. Claim 11 has been amended to rephrase the language referred to in the Office Action.

According to the Office Action, the term “parent” in claim 11 is indefinite. Claim 11 has been amended to replace this term with the term --base--.

In addition, according to the Office Action, the term “standard” rod is unclear. Claim 11 has been amended to clarify that the standard rod is supplied separately from the base material of the glass rod to adjust a vertical inclination of a drawing axis. Thus, the vertical inclination of the hanging mechanism and the elongating mechanism is adjusted along an axis of the standard rod.

In view of the aforementioned amendments to claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-13 are not indefinite.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 11-13 are rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Hoshino.

As noted above, claim 11 has been amended to clarify that the standard rod is supplied separately from the base material of the glass rod to adjust a vertical inclination of a drawing axis so that the vertical inclination of the hanging mechanism and the elongating mechanism is adjusted along an axis of the standard rod.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hoshino does not teach this feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Hoshino does not anticipate instant claims 11-13.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections set forth in the Office Action be withdrawn and that claims 11-13 be allowed.

If any fees under 37 C. F. R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 are due in connection with this filing, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Order No. 034103.011DIV1.

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: May A. Montebello (#33,021)
for Frederick F. Calvetti, Reg. No. 28,557
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Dated:

FFC/MM/ss